2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

themselves during the winter, or if he had sufficient means, purchase hay or rent land on which to raise it. The related hangers-on of a wealthy man who had helped harvest his hay had the privilege of gleaning what was left after the first cutting and sometimes of cutting hay in the poorer parts of the meadow.

Agricultural lands were not extensive and were the private property of individuals. To some extent they belonged to affluent persons and were worked by their laborers and henchmen. More generally, however, they were subsistence plots cultivated by poor families who had no cattle. It is difficult to get specific information on how such an impoverished family might obtain the land in the first place on which to start operations. As far as I could learn it was merely a question of settling down and cultivating. No one seems to have had any objection to the launching of such an enterprise but all looked upon its practitioners with disdain as people who had lost all social standing.[85]

In reference to all forms of strictly individual property in land it seems likely that we are dealing with comparatively recent innovations in Kazak culture resulting from the influence of the sedentary populations in the Central Asian khanates to the south and in Russian territory to the north. The tendency to personal ownership in land appears simultaneously and in connection with the increase of permanent winter habitations, the storing of fodder for the winter, the introduction of agriculture, and the emphasis on sheep and cattle raising as opposed to horse culture.[85a]

INHERITANCE

The system of inheritance of property among the Kazak was simple in principle although its details in any given case might become highly complex. Properly speaking only the youngest son inherited, the others normally being provided for during the lifetime of the father. When a son married or came of age he was given a share (enci) of his father's animals and established his own household. The age at which this occurred varied with the wealth and social position of the father, being earlier among the rich. In any event it did not normally take place before the son was fifteen years old.[86] Before this time the son had no property of his own, but afterward the father had no control over that which had been allotted to him.[87] The division among all the sons except the youngest was occasionally made at one time, before witnesses, rather than as each son came of age. Such divisions frequently presented difficulties which might be arbitrated by the leaders of the group to decide the minimum share to which each son was entitled. Beyond this minimum the father might assign the property as he saw fit,[88] although according to my information it was customary

[85] Compare Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 213–14.

[85a] The historical and geographical factors influencing the development of land tenure among the Kazak have recently been discussed by E. E. Bacon in a paper read before the American Anthropological Association in New Haven, December, 1937.

[86] Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 43.

[87] *Idem*, 34.

[88] Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 153–54.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

565

The precise status and privileges of a White Bone as such apart from other considerations cannot be sharply defined. "One accords them respect and precedence and at feasts assigns them the most honored place and the choicest morsels."[17] Grodekov[18] says that in his time [1885] there was no distinction in law between White and Black Bones, and adds that "In the Aulie-ata district they deny any privileges to White Bones . . . and now the people say: 'The slaves are now free. Freedom is given no less to us; to rude treatment we answer rudely'." This clearly implies that formerly the situation was different. Jochelson claims,[19] again without mentioning his authority, that by Kazak law the White Bones had privileges and advantages in land owning. Such in any case would seem to have been true in practice so far as the White Bones comprised a ruling and owning class.

Summing up the rather unsatisfactory evidence, it may be said that the term White Bone can hardly be taken to mean a clearly defined caste, but rather to indicate generally those who enjoyed the highest prestige in Kazak society. It is not unlikely that the rigidity of distinctions between Black and White Bones had been weakened first by the inclusion of persons distinguished for religious reasons and later by the collapse of the power of the khans and their families after the Russian conquest.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS BASED ON WEALTH

[558]

Class distinctions as conditioned by economic relationships have been mentioned in a previous section but may be enlarged upon here. The poor or middle class Kazak was always in a precarious situation because the loss of his few cattle placed him in complete subjection to the wealthy owners of large herds. Radlov observed[20] that a Kazak who had lost his animals through drought or a severe winter had no recourse but to hire himself out as a worker. Ujfalvy[21] mentions the numerous impoverished people who were obliged to enter the service of the rich and adds: "Leur position équivaut à un véritable servage. Ils servent sans recevoir de salaire et pour la nourriture seulement." Quite another picture is drawn by Grodekov, who says that agricultural workers received as wages from a fourth to a half of the harvest and ate at the table of their master, who acted as a father toward them, calling them "my sons." In return the worker was expected to advance the interests of his patron in every possible way.[22]

As a contrast to this, Kargabaiev, who remembered the old days himself, said that the poor herdsman was not entitled to shelter in the master's kibitka. If he slept there at all he must stretch himself across the doorway and above all not approach the left side of the

[17] Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 146–47.

[18] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 5.

[19] *Peoples of Asiatic Russia*, 84.

[20] *Aus Sibirien*, 1: 416.

[21] *Expédition scientifique*, 2: 112.

[22] Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 217. Koz'min, in discussing Turco-Mongol feudalism in general writes "The relations of lord and vassal in Central Asia . . . approached the relationship of father and son . . . or of elder brother and younger brother. . . . " (*K Voprosy o Turetsko-mongol'skom Feodalizme*, 66.)

for maintenance. After receiving the bride price or inchi they continued to serve their masters, from whom they received various gains. The former Tulenkut are still servants now, but for pay. The name, in addition, is going out of use.

Among the Kirgiz the manap are the best people, descending from a whole line of biis. Yet they do not receive any more honor than all the good people, in general. Manap is not entirely a title of descent. If the son of a manap is worse than the father, wicked or impoverished, then he ceases to be a manap. On the other hand, an upstart from the simple people, even though he be a good person, cannot be a manap. Biis can and could be in the past not only manaps but also non-manaps, without distinction. (1)

1. Communication of bii Kurpetai Dauletkulov.

The honorable Kirgiz Mulla Asan, a manap himself, communicated the following concerning the manaps:

"Manap is a title similar to the Russian Prince. Not a single manap is descended from the house of Chingiz Khan. Those who stood out from the people (yurtan ozyb), who were outstanding for their bravery and generosity and who commanded the people at times without leadership became manaps. At times of enemy invasions they assembled all the people and those who commanded them (el bashlagan) were those who themselves stood out among the other manaps (uzi ozyb chykkan). They were not elected, but if they began to have elections, they would elect them.

"There are no genealogical registers of the manaps.

"In the Auliye-Ata uyezd now the following persons with their kin are considered to be manaps: I (Mullah Asan Dzhangel-Din), /7/ Kydyrali Nurakov, Shadybek Sarymsakov, Nazar Khangel'diev, Kanai Bekmuradov, Seid Kachkin, Egemberdi Usekov and Irsali Nurav. None of these are related to each other."

There are no Tiuri or Telenkut among the Kirgiz.

The slaves (1) freed by the Russians, have been completely lost.

1. The slaves were called kiimdy tugan bala (son, born clothed).

Apparently most of them returned to their native lands. Part of them began to marry Kazakhs, and some became mixed with them by adoption.

• • • •